



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/806,967	03/23/2004	Mao-I Wu	24061.112 (TSMC2003-0571)	2328
43717 7590 08/20/2009 HAYNES AND BOONE, LLP IP Section 2323 Victory Avenue Suite 700 Dallas, TX 75219				
EXAMINER				
OSMAN, RAMY M				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2457				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
08/20/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/806,967

Applicant(s)

WU ET AL.

Examiner

RAMY M. OSMAN

Art Unit

2457

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 April 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5,7-12,14-17,19 and 20 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-5,7-12,14-17,19 and 20 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Status of Claims

1. This action is responsive to amendment filed on April 16, 2009, where Applicant amended claims 2-5,7-12,14-17,19-20 and cancelled claims 1,13. Claims 2-5,7-12,14-17,19,20 remain pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Objection to claim 20 is withdrawn.
3. Applicant's arguments filed 4/16/09 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
4. Amendment to drawings is acknowledged.
5. Applicant traverses the 101 rejections of the limitations "computer readable medium".

In reply, the 101 rejection is maintained. The limitation "computer readable medium" is a broad limitation that encompasses non hardware elements, like signals, waves, software data structures, etc. Since this language is not limiting to hardware elements, then it is seen to not fall within any of the statutory categories.

6. Applicant argues that Figure 3 of the instant Application provides support for the limitation "*denying the first router any access to the second network*".

In reply, the language of denying the first router access to the second network contains an inherent implication that the first router makes a request to or makes an attempt to access the second network, where that request/attempt is then denied by the second network or by some other entity. "Denying" occurs only in the presence of a requestor and a denier, where the

requestor is denied by the denier. In this case, the first router would be the requestor. And in this case, Applicants disclosure does not support 'denying'.

7. Applicant argues that there is no valid reason for modifying Myers in view of Hericourt.

In reply, Firstly, regarding first full paragraph of pg 12 of remarks, Hericourt.was not relied upon to teach allowing access. Myers was relied upon to show that teaching.

Secondly, regarding beginning of second full paragraph of pg 12 of remarks, the rejection did not state that Myers fails to provide caching. The mentioned local caching in the rejection is local to the proxy, ie proxy caching.

Thirdly, regarding end of second full paragraph of pg 12 of remarks, to restate the motivation: A proxy cache server is useful for relieving the client of the task of storing web information for later retrieval. This frees storage resources on the client, and it is thus obvious to use proxy cache server.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

8. Claims 14-17 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter. The claims recite a "computer readable medium". This language is broad and enables the scope of "computer readable medium" to encompass a software-only embodiment and to encompass signals and waves. Software per se, and signals do not fall within any of the statutory categories. The medium must be clearly hardware only. The current language does not fall within any of the statutory categories.

See MPEP Chapter 2106.01 Section I.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

9. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

10. Claims 2-5,7-12,14-17,19,20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The independent claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. For example, claim 1 states “*denying the first router any access to the second network*”. However, this is not supported in Applicants specification. There is no mention of the second network, or any other entity, denying access to the first router, and how this is performed. “Denying” occurs only in the presence of a requestor and a denier, where the requestor is denied by the denier. In this case, the first router would be the requestor. And in this case, Applicants disclosure does not support ‘denying’.

The dependent claims are rejected because they inherit the deficiencies of the independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. Claims 2-3,5,7-12,14-17,19,20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Myers et al (US Patent Publication No 2004/0122956) in view of Kim et al (US Patent Publication No 2005/0005110) in further view of Hericourt (US Patent No 6,792,461).

13. In reference to claims 4, 16 & 19, Myers teaches a corresponding method, computer readable medium, and system, all respectively for providing network access, and comprising:

providing a first access point for a first computing device (see Figure 1B bottom #18, and see ¶55 lines 6-9, Myers discloses a radio unit (i.e. first access point) that is for customer mobile unit (i.e. first computing device));

connecting the first computing device to a first network (Figure 1B #56 and ¶ lines 11-12, Myers discloses connecting the customer mobile unit to the Internet (i.e. first network));

providing a second access point for a second computing device (Figure 1B top #18 and ¶ 55 lines 6-9, Myers discloses a second radio unit (i.e. second access point) that is for executive mobile unit (i.e second computing device));

accessing a second router through the second access point (Figure 1A #14 and ¶45 lines 3-6, Myers discloses accessing a router portal (i.e. second router) through the radio unit (i.e. second access point)); and

connecting the second computing device to a second network (Figures 1A & 1B #52 and ¶ 51 lines 13-14, Myer discloses connecting the executive mobile unit to the Intranet (i.e. second network)).

Myers fails to explicitly teach where the first computing device accesses a first router through the first access point. However, Kim teaches that it is desirable to maintain network security for an intranet/internet system by providing service classes that permit or limit access to

the network system (¶ 12 lines 1-7 and ¶ 30 lines 17-25). Kim discloses that for example, a visitor to the system can be limited to access only the internet (¶ 30 line 26), and the visitor would access the internet by connecting from the port 312 (Figure 3 #312) to the router 304 (Figure 3 #304), where the router 304 enables internet access for the visitor (¶ 30 lines 9-16). Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myers by enabling access to a first router through the first access point, where the first router would enable the first computing device to connect to a first network (i.e. internet), as per the teachings of Kim. One would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of maintaining network security for an intranet/internet system whereby a visitor to the system is limited to only access the internet through a router within the system and whereby the visitor is restricted from accessing information on the intranet. Combining the two routers (i.e. the router of Myers and the router of Kim) into a single network would be obvious so as to enhance the versatility of the network while maintaining security of the network.

Since Applicants specifications fails to support the amended limitation of “denying the first router any access to the second router”, it is therefore broadly interpreted to mean denying a user of one network to access the other network. In this regards, both Myers and Kim teach that some users are restricted access to either Internet only or to Intranet only (example, see Kim end of ¶ 30) . Therefore, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to deny a user using one network (i.e. Internet) to access the other network (i.e. Intranet) for the purpose of restricting a visitor user from accessing any private information that may be located on the Intranet.

Myers and Kim fail to explicitly teach routing to a proxy server through the first router. However, Hericourt discloses routing to a proxy server through a router where the proxy server is connected to the Internet (column 11 lines 9-18). Hericourt teaches that the proxy servers are utilized for the purpose of locally caching HTTP data from the Internet and providing the cached data to a workstation that sends a request for that particular HTTP data (column 11 lines 14-25). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myers and Kim by routing to a proxy server through the first router as per the teachings of Hericourt. One would be motivated to do so for the purpose of utilizing the proxy servers as cache servers in order to locally cache HTTP data from the Internet and then provide it to a workstation that sends a request for that particular HTTP data, and which increases efficiency.

14. In reference to claims 2 and 15, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 4 and the respective computer readable medium of claim 16, wherein the second network is a company intranet (Myers, Figures 1A & 1B #52 and ¶ 51 lines 13-14).

15. In reference to claims 3 and 14, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 4 and the respective computer readable medium of claim 16, wherein the first network is the Internet (Myers, Figure 1B #56 and ¶ lines 11-12).

16. In reference to claims 5 and 17, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 4 and the respective computer readable medium of claim 16, furthering comprising providing web access filtering for the first computing device (¶ 111 lines 6-20, Myers discloses web site filtering).

17. In reference to claim 7, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 4. Myers fails to explicitly teach further comprising providing a firewall to restrict access to the second network. However, Kim discloses a firewall 222 (Figure 3) that protects the intranet from external intruders (¶ 30 lines 1-3). It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myers by providing a firewall to restrict access to the second network as per the teachings of Kim. One would be motivated to do so in order to protect the intranet from external intruders.

18. In reference to claim 8, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 4 furthering comprising providing data encryption for the second computing device (Myers, ¶ 53 lines 1-6).

19. In reference to claims 9 and 20, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 1 and the respective system of claim 19, wherein the first computing device is a laptop computer (Myers, ¶ 41 line 5).

20. In reference to claim 10, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 4 wherein the first computing device is a cellular telephone (Myers, ¶ 111 line 18).

21. In reference to claim 11, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 4 wherein the first access point and the second access point belong to separate devices (Myers, Figure 1B top and bottom #18's).

22. In reference to claim 12, Myers in view of Kim teach the method of claim 4. Myers fails to explicitly teach wherein the first router and the second router belong to separate devices. However, Kim discloses two separate routers, one for the intranet connectivity and another for internet connectivity (Figure 3 and ¶ 30 lines 9-26) for enabling internet/intranet security. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Myers where the first

router and the second router belong to separate devices, as per the teachings of Kim. One would have been motivated to do so for the purpose of maintaining network security for an intranet/internet system whereby a visitor to the system is limited to only access the internet through a router within the system and whereby the visitor is restricted from accessing information on the intranet.

Conclusion

23. The above rejections are based upon the broadest reasonable interpretation of the claims. Applicant is advised that the specified citations of the relied upon prior art, in the above rejections, are only representative of the teachings of the prior art, and that any other supportive sections within the entirety of the reference (including any figures, incorporation by references, claims and/or priority documents) is implied as being applied to teach the scope of the claims.

24. Applicant may not introduce any new matter to the claims or to the specification. For any subsequent response that contains new/amended claims, Applicant is required to cite its corresponding support in the specification. (See MPEP chapter 2163.03 section (I.) and chapter 2163.04 section (I.) and chapter 2163.06)

25. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to RAMY M. OSMAN whose telephone number is (571)272-4008. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9-5.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Ramy M Osman/
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2457

August 16, 2009

